

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA

County of San Diego

DATE: July 19, 2006

DEPT. 71

REPORTER A: Peter Stewart

CSR# 3184

PRESENT HON. Ronald S. Prager

REPORTER B:

CSR#

JUDGE

CLERK: K. Sandoval

BAILIFF:

REPORTER'S ADDRESS: P.O. BOX 120128

SAN DIEGO, CA 92112-4104

MINUTE ORDER

IN RE: JCCP 4221/4224/4226&4428 – Natural Gas Anti-Trust Cases (Pipeline)

The attached Court's applies to all cases listed as follows:

4221-00001	PHILLIP vs EL PASO MERCHANT ENERGY
4221-00002	PHILLIP vs EL PASO MERCHANT ENERGY
4221-00003	CONTINENTAL FORGE COMPANY vs SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GAS COMPANY
4221-00004	BERG vs SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GAS COMPANY
4221-00005	THE CITY OF LONG BEACH vs SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GAS COMPANY
4221-00006	THE CITY OF LOS vs SOUTHERN CALIFOR
4221-00005	SWEETIE'S A CALIFORNIA PARTNERSHIP vs EL PASO CORPORATION
4221-00006	THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES vs SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GAS COMPANY
4221-00007	SWEETIE'S A CALIFORNIA PARTNERSHIP vs EL PASO CORPORATION
4221-00008	CALIFORNIA DAIRIES INC vs EL PASO CORPORATION
4221-00009	DRY CREEK CORPORATION (JCCP 4228) vs EL PASO NATURAL GAS COMPANY
4221-00010	HACKETT vs EL PASO CORP
4221-00011	THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES vs SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GAS COMPANY
4221-00012	THE CITY OF VERNON vs SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GAS COMPANY
4221-00013	WORLD OIL CORP vs SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GAS COMPANY
4221-00014	CITY OF UPLAND vs SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GAS COMPANY
4221-00015	THE COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO vs SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GAS COMPANY
4221-00016	EDGINGTON OIL COMPANY vs SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GAS COMPANY
4221-00017	THE CITY OF CULVER CITY vs SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GAS COMPANY
4221-00018	THE CITY OF BURBANK vs SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GAS COMPANY
4221-00019	THUMS LONG BEACH COMPANY vs SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GAS COMPANY

2:05 p.m. This being the time previously set for EX PARTE HEARING in the above entitled cause Court convenes in chambers with counsel as noted appearing telephonically:

Brad Baker of Baker Burton and Lundy
John Shaeffer of O'Donnell Shaeffer

Richard Levy and Robert Berry of Gibson Dunn & Crutcher
Paul Traina of Engstrom, Lipscomb & Lack
Martin Goyette Department of Justice State of California
Robert Borthwick of Septra Energy

Court and counsel discuss the final order on the settlement of the pipeline case.

Attorney Goyette presents argument regarding the word “improperly” in the settlement decree.

Attorneys Berry and Shaeffer disagree that the word should be withdrawn from the decree. The language is in the notice and approved settlement agreement they state.

The Court rules that the request of the Attorney General to modify the proposed order by withdrawing the word “improperly” is denied.

The Court notes Attorney Lindmark has filed objections to the settlement and the Court rejects the objections. Though notified of the hearing Mr. Lindmark does not appear..

The Court advises counsel that he will sign the Judgement Final Order and Decree granting final approval to the class action settlement with the Sempra Defendants.

Court and counsel discuss the disbursement of funds from the settlement. Court directs the Sempra Defendants to pay the first installment on August 9, 2006. If counsel cannot agree on the timeframe they are to meet and confer and come in ex parte. Counsel to inform the Court of the results and schedule a date if needed.

ks